UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/036,315	12/26/2001	Paul S. Hanson	10194.8034US1	2737

30083 7590 10/07/2005

PERKINS COIE LLP/AWS
P.O. BOX 1247
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247

EXAMINER	
GILLIS, BRIAN J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/036,315	HANSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brian J. Gillis	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 December 2001 and 15 August 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *15 and 17* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14,16 and 18-40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *26 December 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 25, 30, 31, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schmuelling et al (US Patent #6,603,758).

(Claim 1 discloses) a system for enabling a computer user to select from a plurality of service providers using a single high-speed data connection, the system being capable of connecting a computer device having a client application with a user-selected service provider, the system comprising: a distributed system network having at least one receiving router for receiving communication from the computer device having the client application (Schmuelling et al shows a network which allows bi-directional communication from the device to the network (Figure 3).); and at least one tunnel server, each at least one tunnel server connecting the at least one receiving router with at least one transmitting router, the at least one transmitting router communicating with at least one service provider (Schmuelling et al shows of an infrastructure which connects a device to a transmitting router which connects to a service provider (Figure 3, 132, 304).); wherein the computer user can select, using the

client application, a one service provider from a plurality of available service providers using a single high-speed data connection via the at least one tunnel server, before the computer device with the client application is connected to a network associated with the one service provider (Schmuelling et al shows of a user registering for an internet service provider prior to connecting to a network associated with the provider (column 4, lines 10-28)).

(Claim 2 discloses) the system according to claim 1, wherein each service provider may be an internet service provider, an online service provider, or a corporate intranet service. (Schmuelling et al shows the service provider is an internet service provider (column 2, lines 45-50)).

(Claim 3 discloses) the system according to claim 1 wherein the client application presents a selection page listing the plurality of service providers (Schmuelling et al shows the browser presents the user with a list of providers (column 4, lines 10-28)).

(Claim 4 discloses) the system according to claim 3 wherein the client application further comprises a registration service wherein the user may register for service provider from the plurality of service providers (Schmuelling et al shows the user registers for an internet service provider from a list (column 4, lines 29-37)).

(Claim 5 discloses) the system according to claim 4, wherein registration and authentication for each service provider for which the user registers is populated to the distributed system network (Schmuelling et al shows the infrastructure is notified of the registration and authentication (column 4, lines 39-52)).

(Claim 7 discloses) the system of claim 5, wherein the registration, activation and authentication for each service provider occurs via a single data service (Schmuelling et al shows the registration, activation, and authentication all occur in the infrastructure (column 4, lines 23-52)).

(Claim 8 discloses) the system according to claim 4, wherein registration occurs using an agent registration service (Schmuelling et al shows the registration takes place using a registration server (column 7, lines 22-40)).

(Claim 25 discloses) a method of enabling a computer user to choose a service provider from a list of service providers, the method comprising: before accessing a high-speed data environment, presenting the computer user with the list of service providers from which to choose (Schmuelling et al shows the user is presented with a list of service providers before connecting to a provider (column 4, lines 10-22).); and upon the user selecting a service provider from the list of service providers and clicking a connect button, establishing a connection between a computer device operated by the computer user and the selected service provider within the high-speed data environment (Schmuelling et al shows once an agreement is finalized the user is connected to the selected service provider (column 4, lines 39-52)).

(Claim 30 discloses) the method of enabling a computer user to choose a service provider from a list of service providers of claim 25, wherein each service provider in the list of service providers may be an internet service provider, on-line service prouder or corporate intranet service (Schmuelling et al shows the service provider is an internet service provider (column 2, lines 45-50)).

(Claim 31 discloses) a method of enabling a user to connect to a chosen service provider from a list of service providers, the method comprising: before accessing a high-speed data network, displaying the list of service providers from which the user may choose based on a single user-input action; and in response to a single user-input action being performed, connecting the user to the chosen service provider over the high-speed data network (Schmuelling et al shows a user is presented a list of internet service providers and can register and then is connected to the provider (column 4, lines 10-28)).

(Claim 35 discloses) a system for enabling a computer user to select a service provider from a plurality of service providers using a single high-speed data connection, the system comprising: presenting means for presenting a list of service providers available for user registration (Schmuelling et al shows a list is presented to the user in a browser (column 4, lines 10-23).); receiving means for receiving login information associated with the user and each registered service provider (Schmuelling et al shows the login information for the user is received (column 4, lines 29-37).); storing means for storing login information for each registered service provider (Schmuelling et al shows a database holds the login information (column 4, lines 39-52).); and connecting means for connecting the user to the selected service provider after the user selects a service provider (Schmuelling et al shows the user is connected to the provider after a selection is made (column 4, lines 10-28)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6, 9, 10, 26, and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmuelling et al (US Patent #6,603,758) in view of Xu et al (US Patent #6,151,628).

Claim 6 discloses the system according to claim 5, wherein data communicating between the computer device and the receiving router occurs through a fixed wireless network. Schmuelling et al teaches of the limitations of claim 5 as recited above. It fails to teach of communicating through a fixed wireless network. Xu et al teaches of communicating via a wireless network (column 3, lines 54-62).

Schmuelling et al and Xu et al are analogous art because they are both related to providing network access.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the wireless network Xu et al with the system in Schmuelling et al because it provides direct access to the Internet and other computer networks for remote users such as wireless users (Xu et al, column 2, lines 66-67, column 3, lines 1-3).

Claim 9 discloses the system of claim 8, wherein activation occurs using a fixed wireless node. Schmuelling et al teaches of the limitations of claim 4 as recited above.

It fails to teach of activation using a fixed wireless node. Xu et al teaches of having a network authentication server on the network, and having activation occur using a fixed wireless node (column 5, lines 34-42, column 8, lines 65-67, column 9, lines 1-4, figure 1).

Schmuelling et al and Xu et al are analogous art because they are both related to providing network access.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the wireless network in Xu et al with the system in Schmuelling et al because it provides direct access to the Internet and other computer networks for remote users such as wireless users (Xu et al, column 2, lines 66-67, column 3, lines 1-3).

Claim 10 discloses the system of claim 9, wherein authentication occurs in the distributed service network. Schmuelling et al further teaches authentications occur in the network (column 4, lines 39-52).

Claim 26 discloses the method of enabling a computer user to choose a service provider of claim 25, wherein the computer device is associated with a fixed provider from a fixed wireless network. Schmuelling et al teaches of the limitations of claim 25 as recited above. It fails to teach of communicating through a fixed wireless network. Xu et al teaches of communicating via a wireless network (column 3, lines 54-62).

Schmuelling et al and Xu et al are analogous art because they are both related to providing network access.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the wireless network in Xu et al with the system in Schmuelling et al because it provides direct access to the Internet and other computer networks for remote users such as wireless users (Xu et al, column 2, lines 66-67, column 3, lines 1-3).

Claim 36 discloses a method of enabling a user to choose a service provider from a list of service providers, the method comprising; before accessing one or more high-speed data networks, inputting login information associated with the user and at least one service provider; receiving a list of service providers available for user registration from a server computer wherein the service providers provide access to the high-speed data networks; and before connecting to the one or more high-speed data networks, selecting a service provider from the list of service providers, wherein the server computer is adapted to then facilitate connecting the user with the selected service provider. Schmuelling et al teaches of receiving a list of available service providers and selecting from the list a service provider before being connected to the network (column 4, lines 10-28). It fails to teach of inputting login information associating the user and service provider. Xu et al teaches of login information associating the user and the provider (column 8, lines 57-60).

Schmuelling et al and Xu et al are analogous art because they are both related to providing network access.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the login system in Xu et al with the system in Schmuelling et al

because the network authentications determines whether the user is permitted to access the computer network (Xu et al, column 2, lines 34-36).

Claim 37 discloses the method of claim 36 wherein the login information includes a user id and a password. Xu et al further teaches of login information including a user id and password (column 8, lines 57-60, column 11, lines 65-67 – column 12, lines 1-3).

Claim 38 discloses the method of claim 36 wherein the connection between the user and the selected service provider is a fixed wireless connection. Xu et al further teaches of communicating via a wireless network (column 3, lines 54-62).

Claims 11-14, 16, 18, 19, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmuelling et al (US Patent #6,603,758) in view of Alter (WIPO WO 00/14919).

Claim 11 discloses the system of claim 1, further comprising: a virtual private network tunnel connection entry that is automatically configured for each service provider in a windows dial-up networking scenario. Schmuelling et al teaches of the limitations of claim 1 as recited above. It fails to teach of a virtual private network tunnel connection that is configured for each service provider. Alter teaches of using a virtual private network, which is well known in the art (page 15, lines 1-3).

Schmuelling et al and Alter are analogous art because they are both related to computer network accessing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the virtual private network in Alter with the system in Schmuelling et

al because a user is able to access a service provider without having the complete infrastructure (page 1, lines 32-33 – page 2, line 1).

Claim 12 discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the client application provides a plurality of high-speed data related tools. Schmuelling et al teaches of the limitations of claim 1 as recited above. It fails to teach of providing a list of tools. Alter et al teaches of presenting the user with a selection of options (page 9, lines 20-32).

Schmuelling et al and Alter are analogous art because they are both related to computer network accessing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the selection of options in Alter with the system in Schmuelling et al because a user is able to choose to subscribe to a service provider from a list of providers using these options (page 9, lines 1-5).

Claim 13 discloses the system of claim 12, of high-speed data related tools comprise at least one of a support tool, a diagnostics tool, an alert tool, an updating tool, an access tool, a service provider choice tool and a messaging tool. Alter further teaches one of the options is a service provider choice tool (page 9, lines 27-32 – page 10, lines 1-2).

Claim 14 discloses the system of claim 13, wherein the user may select the service provider from a plurality of available service providers using a service provider selection tool. Alter further teaches the user may select a service provider using the service provider selection option (page 9, lines 27-32 – page 10, lines 1-2).

Claim 16 discloses a computer-readable medium for storing a client application to be installed on a computer device associated with a high-speed data network, wherein the client application: presents a user of the computer device with a tools menu including tools for controlling and monitoring a high-speed data connection over the high-speed data network; presents the user with an option to choose a service provider session page; upon the user choosing the service provider session page, presents the user with a plurality of service providers from which to choose; and after the user chooses a service provider from the plurality of service providers under the service provider session page, then connects the computer device to the chosen service provider over the high-speed data network. Schmuelling teaches of selecting from a list of service providers and connecting to a high-speed network connection using the selected service provider (column 4, lines 10-28). It fails to teach of presenting a user with a tools menu, which will allow a user to make a selection. Alter teaches of allowing the monitoring of a network connection and allowing a user to select a service provider from an options display (page 9, lines 27-32 – page 10, lines 1-2, page 16, lines 22-33).

Schmuelling et al and Alter are analogous art because they are both related to computer network accessing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the selection of options in Alter with the system in Schmuelling et al because a user is able to choose to subscribe to a service provider from a list of providers using these options (page 9, lines 1-5).

Claim 18 discloses the computer-readable medium for storing a client application of claim 16, wherein the tools for controlling and monitoring a high-speed data connection comprise at least one of a support tool, a diagnostic tool, an alert tool, an update tool, an access tool, a service provider session tool and a message tool. Alter further teaches one of the options is a service provider choice tool (page 9, lines 27-32 – page 10, lines 1-2).

Claim 19 discloses the computer-readable medium for storing a client application of claim 18, wherein the tools for controlling and monitoring a high-speed data connection further comprise a member services tool. Alter further teaches of providing network-monitoring options containing information about members

Claim 32 discloses the method of enabling a user to connect to of service providers of claim 31, further comprising; a chosen service provider from a list in response to a single action by the user, displaying a list of registratable service providers for which the user may register and add service providers to the list of service providers from which the user may choose. Schmuelling et al teaches of the limitations of claim 31 as recited above. It fails to teach of providing a list of tools. Alter et al teaches of presenting the user with a selection of options and one of the options is a service provider choice tool (page 9, lines 20-32 – page 10, lines 1-2).

Schmuelling et al and Alter are analogous art because they are both related to computer network accessing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the selection of options in Alter with the system in Schmuelling et al

because a user is able to choose to subscribe to a service provider from a list of providers using these options (page 9, lines 1-5).

Claim 21, 24, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmuelling et al (US Patent #6,603,758) in view of Bouvier et al (US Patent #6,430,276).

Claim 21 discloses a method of enabling a user to choose a service provider from a list of service providers, the method comprising: before accessing one or more high-speed data networks, presenting a list of service providers available for user registration, wherein the service providers provide access to the high-speed data networks; for each service provider for which the user registers, storing login information associated with the user and each registered service provider; upon subsequent user login, retrieving the stored login information for each registered service provider; presenting a list of registered service providers to the user; and upon the user choosing a service provider and clicking a connect button, connecting the user to the chosen service provider over the one or more high-speed data networks. Schmuelling et al teaches of presenting a user a list of service providers available for registration prior to connecting, storing login information for the selected providers, presenting a list of registered service providers to a user and once a selection is made, connecting the user to the network (column 3, lines 14-15, column 4, lines 10-28, 38-53). It fails to teach of retrieving the stored login information for each provider. Bouvier et al teaches of storing information relating to all the different subscriptions one user may have, retrieving the

login information and presenting the list of subscriptions to the user (column 5, lines 50-59, column 6, lines 11-16, column 7, lines 28-34).

Schmuelling et al and Bouvier et al are analogous art because they are both related to a user subscribing to a service.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the login retrieval in Bouvier et al with the system in Schmuelling et al because this provides a user with a single authentication, authorization, and accounting point to access different networks (Bouvier et al, column 5, lines 25-30).

Claim 24 discloses the method of enabling a user to choose a service provider from a list of service providers of claim 21, wherein presenting a list of service providers available for user registration further comprises presenting the user with an option to register for other service providers. Bouvier et al further teaches of presenting the user with an option to register for other providers (column 9, lines 65-66 – column 10, lines 1-10).

Claim 28 discloses the method of enabling a computer user to choose a service provider from a list of service providers of claim 25, further comprising; when the user selects a service provider from the list of service providers, pre-populating a name field and password field with stored information associated with the selected service provider. Bouvier et al further teaches of a method, which after the user is authenticated, information is returned from the database to the application so the application can use the users information to provide the appropriate connection to the user (column 7, lines 17-21, 29-35).

Schmuelling et al and Bouvier et al are analogous art because they are both related to a user subscribing to a service.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the login retrieval in Bouvier et al with the system in Schmuelling et al because this provides a user with a single authentication, authorization, and accounting point to access different networks (Bouvier et al, column 5, lines 25-30).

Claim 29 discloses the method of enabling a computer user to choose a service provider from a list of service providers of claim 28, wherein establishing a connection between a computer device operated by the computer user and the selected service provider further comprises establishing a point-to-point over Ethernet connection. It is widely known in the art that a network connection can be established using a variety of methods including dial-up and an Ethernet connection.

Claims 20, 33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmuelling et al (US Patent #6,603,758) in view of Alter (WIPO WO 00/14919) as applied to claims 18 and 31 above, and further in view of Xu et al (US Patent #6,151,628).

Claim 20 discloses the computer-readable medium for storing a client application of claim 19, wherein the client application relates to a fixed wireless high-speed data network. Schmuelling et al in view of Alter teaches of the limitations of claim 18 as recited above. It fails to teach of using a fixed wireless high-speed data environment. Xu et al teaches of communicating via a wireless network (column 3, lines 54-62).

Schmuelling et al in view of Alter and Xu et al are analogous art because they are related to providing network access.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the login system in Xu et al with the system in Schmuelling et al in view of Alter because it provides direct access to the Internet and other computer networks for remote users such as wireless users (Xu et al, column 2, lines 66-67, column 3, lines 1-3).

Claim 33 discloses the method of enabling a user to connect to a chosen service provider from a list of service providers of claim 32, wherein the method is associated with a fixed wireless high-speed data network. Schmuelling et al in view of Alter teaches of the limitations of claim 32 as recited above. It fails to teach of using a fixed wireless high-speed data environment. Xu et al teaches of communicating via a wireless network (column 3, lines 54-62).

Schmuelling et al in view of Alter and Xu et al are analogous art because they are related to providing network access.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the login system in Xu et al with the system in Schmuelling et al in view of Alter because it provides direct access to the Internet and other computer networks for remote users such as wireless users (Xu et al, column 2, lines 66-67, column 3, lines 1-3).

Claim 34 discloses the method of enabling a user to connect to a chosen service provider from a list of service providers of claim 33, wherein each service provider may

be one of an internet service provider, an online service provider, or a corporate intranet service. Schmuelling et al further teaches the service provider is an internet service provider (column 2, lines 45-50).

Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmuelling et al (US Patent #6,603,758) in view of Bouvier et al (US Patent #6,430,276) as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Xu et al (US Patent #6,151,628).

Claim 22 discloses the method of enabling a user to choose a service provider from a list of service providers according to claim 21, wherein the method is associated with a fixed wireless high-speed data environment. Schmuelling et al in view of Bouvier teaches of the limitations of claim 21 as recited above. It fails to teach of using a fixed wireless high-speed data environment. Xu et al teaches of communicating via a wireless network (column 3, lines 54-62).

Schmuelling et al in view of Bouvier et al and Xu et al are analogous art because they are related to providing network access.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the login system in Xu et al with the system in Schmuelling et al in view of Bouvier et al because it provides direct access to the Internet and other computer networks for remote users such as wireless users (Xu et al, column 2, lines 66-67, column 3, lines 1-3).

Claim 23 discloses the method of enabling a user to choose a service provider from a list of service providers according to claim 22, wherein the method is initiated by

a client application on a computer device. Schmuelling et al further teaches the client browser initiates a service provider selection window (column 4, lines 10-22).

Claims 27 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmuelling et al (US Patent #6,603,758) in view of Xu et al (US Patent #6,151,628) as applied to claims 26 and 36 above, and further in view of Bouvier et al (US Patent #6,430,276).

Claim 27 discloses the method of enabling a computer user to choose a service provider from a list of service providers of claim 26, wherein presenting the computer user with the list of service providers from which to choose further comprises presenting the computer user with an option to register for additional service providers. Schmuelling et al in view of Xu et al teaches of the limitations of claim 26 as recited above. It fails to teach of presenting the user the option to register for additional service providers. Bouvier et al teaches of presenting the user with an option to register for other providers (column 9 lines 65-66, column 10, lines 1-11).

Schmuelling et al in view of Xu et al and Bouvier et al are analogous art because they are related to providing network access.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the option to register for other providers in Bouvier et al with the system in Schmuelling et al in view of Xu et al because this provides a user with a single authentication, authorization, and accounting point to access different networks (Bouvier et al, column 5, lines 25-30).

Claim 40 discloses the method of claim 36 further comprising receiving an indication of an option to register for other service providers. Schmuelling et al in view of Xu et al teaches of the limitations of claim 36 as recited above. It fails to teach of receiving an indication of an option to register for other providers. Bouvier et al teaches of receiving a list of providers for the user from a server computer and allowing the user to register for other providers (column 6, lines 11-16, column 9, lines 65-66, column 10, lines 1-11).

Schmuelling et al in view of Xu et al and Bouvier et al are analogous art because they are related to providing network access.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the option to register for other providers in Bouvier et al with the system in Schmuelling et al in view of Xu et al because this provides a user with a single authentication, authorization, and accounting point to access different networks (Bouvier et al, column 5, lines 25-30).

Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmuelling et al (US Patent #6,603,758) in view of Xu et al (US Patent #6,151,628) as applied to claim 36 above, and further in view of Alter (WIPO WO 00/14919).

Claim 39 discloses the method of claim 36 further comprising receiving a list of high- speed data related tools, the high-speed related tools including at least one of a support tool, a diagnostics tool, an alert tool, an updating tool, an access tool, and a messaging tool. Schmuelling et al in view of Xu et al teaches of the limitations of claim

36 as recited above. It fails to teach of providing a list of tools. Alter et al teaches of presenting the user with a selection of options (page 9, lines 20-32).

Schmuelling et al in view of Xu et al and Alter are analogous art because they are related to computer network accessing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the selection of options in Alter with the system in Schmuelling et al in view of Xu et al because a user is able to choose to subscribe to a service provider from a list of providers using these options (page 9, lines 1-5).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14, 16, 18-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Stewart et al (US Patent #6,732,176) teaches of providing network access from multiple providers over a common network.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian J. Gillis whose telephone number is 571-272-7952. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brian J Gillis
Examiner
Art Unit 2141

BJG

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER